DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 215 EA 021 834

AUTHOR Jenni, Roger W.; Mauriel, John J.
TITLE An Examination of the Factors Affecting Stakeholder's Assessment of School Decentralization.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Influence; Community Support; *Decentralization; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Participant Satisfaction; *Participative Decision Making; Policy Formation; *School Based Management; School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Factors that influence the perceptions held by school site council members and others about the quality of site-based management (SBM) are examined in this study. Specifically, the relationships among a group's assessment of SBM, perceived level of influence on council decision making, perceived level of support from other groups, and perceived level of program effectiveness are analyzed. Qualitative and quantitative data from questionnaires administered to site councils of various constituencies in 16 site-managed schools in 4 school districts yielded 118 completed surveys. Response rates by district were 79, 49, 90, and 63 percent. Interviews and observation of council meetings supplemented the surveys. The findings indicated that people did not feel empowered, yet they assigned SBM a moderately high performance score. There was no correlation between feelings of influence on council decision making and the overall assessment of SBM. SBM scores were also highly related to the perceived degree of the principal's support of the program. An inconsistent finding indicated that most groups, especially parents and elementary school teachers, perceived SBM as successful in achieving its goals, but did not feel empowered and were unconcerned about their amount of influence. A possible explanation is that constituents defined success in terms of factors other than major changes in curriculum and the classroom. Appendices include a list of definitions, the survey instrument, return rates, and statistics. (18 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320215

AN EXAMINATION OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING STAKEHOLDER'S ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Roger W. Jenni, Research Associate

University of Minnesota

Strategic Management Research Center

John J. Mauriel, Associate Professor

University of Minnesota

Carlson School of Management

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Prepared for:

The American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April 20, 1990, 8:45-10:15 am, Marriott Hotel, Bentley Room.
Do not print without written permission, comments are welcome.

EA 021 834

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roger W. Jenni

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AN EXAMINATION OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING STAKEHOLDER'S ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that appear to influence the perceptions held by school site council members and others, about the value and quality of the site-based management (SBM) processes operating in their schools. Our preliminary view was that the assessments people made of SBM were related to the degree to which these same people felt that they had influenced site council decisionmaking, and to how much support they felt was given to the SBM process by the administration, staff and other groups, and finally to the degree to which they felt the goals and objectives of the SBM program were being met (whatever these goals and objectives were). In addition, we wanted to identify some of the factors that seemed to be related to people's feeling of influence over the decision-making process at their school sites.

This led us to postulate the following:

1. A group's assessment of its school's site based management program is related to the level of support it feels that others give to the concept.

2. A group's assessment of its school's site based management program is related to its perceived level of influence on site council decisionmaking.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. A group's assessment of its school's site based management program is related to its belief concerning whether or not the program is achieving its goals and objectives.

4. The feeling of influence over site council decisionmaking is related to the perceived level of the support given to SBM by other relevant school system constituencies. (See Appendix A for definitions of terms)

BACKGROUND

School (or site) based management implies a redistribution of power from a centralized locus to decentralized subunits within the organization. In a school district this usually means from the central office to the school building. The administrators (principals) of these "site-managed" schools typically delegate to or share with a local site council, this authority. At least that is what is supposed to happen in theory. The local site councils are comprised of representatives from various groups from within the school's community. These groups commonly include the teaching staff, administrative staff, parents, sometimes students, and occasionally non-parent community members. The decisionmaking authority and role of the school site council is generally set forth in a written agreement or policy statement from the school board. This agreement usually states the purpose of the group, and the philosophical foundation for implementing a decentralized plan, and it may or may not establish the actual delegated decisionmaking powers of the

group. Even if it speaks to these powers, it usually does so in very vague and general terms allowing for some ambiguity in the actual definition. This vagueness and ambiguity leads to differing perceptions about the role and function of SBM in schools and about the role and function of the site council.

Advocacy for school decentralization and shared decisionmaking has come from a variety of sources. Most of the recent plethora of "reform" reports have included recommendations that decisionmaking authority be pushed down to the school level. This desire comes presumably from parents and community members who want more say in the governance of the schools their children attend, from building administration and staff members frustrated by central office and board level constraints on their actions, and from business people and other outsiders who feel that the quality of schools can only improve, in their view, by a major change in the source of authority or the redistribution of that authority through a restructuring of school governance.

When we talk to school officials about the rationale for the implementation of site based management in their schools or school districts, we hear an expression of a sort of faith in what has been termed the "human relations hypothesis" (Miller 1980, Conway 1984). The thinking goes something like the following: if we get people (i.e. site council members) more involved in the decision process, then they will be more satisfied with the decisions and will be more supportive of the schools. Occasionally, someone also states that they think

better decisions will be made. But even people who point to better decisions being made, when pressed for what they mean, seem to be talking about greater satisfaction of the decision-makers rather than about the higher quality of decisions. There continues to be some mixing together of the two ideas of delegation and participation, a point discussed more fully by Cooper, (1988).

The belief seems to be that people who have more influence over decisions will be more satisfied with those decisions and will be thus more supportive and cooperative in getting these decisions implemented. If that is so, then we thought it would be useful to find out just how much influence people feel they have and how this affects their satisfaction with their site management process.

A term popular today is "empowerment". Though we are not exactly sure what this term means to those who use it, we know that one of the arguments for introducing site management is that it is believed to bestow more "power" on the people in the local school, especially on the site council members, and therefore it is believed to be a "good" thing. One view of "power" is the influence people feel they have in decisions made by site councils. We tried in our data analysis efforts to identify what factors made people feel that they had more influence.

Recent empirical research on site council operations gives us little reason to believe that people feel empowered with the current SBM processes. The data seem to indicate that these

councils have little actual influence over key "strategic" school decisions of curriculum, personnel and budget, with the exception that a small portion of the school's total expenditures (typically the instructional supplies budget and occasionally an additional budget for instructional equipment and support) and some aspects of extra-curricular programs and non-academic activities of the school are areas where site councils have assumed some responsibility (Malen & Ogawa, 1989, Lindquist & Mauriel, 1989, Jenni, 1988).

Yet much of the discussion about the need for site management seems to indicate that it is introduced in order to "empower" people at the school level to make decisions. If they are not making key "strategic" decisions (curriculum, budget, and personnel selection and placement) then do they feel "empowered"? If they do, what are some of the factors that lead to this feeling of influence over site council activities? In our work we use perceived influence over site council decision making as the measure of "empowerment", and then tried to find other factors that related to this perception of influence.

METHODOLOGY

Our sample was drawn from the site councils and teaching corps of sixteen schools from four Minnesota school districts. One district we studied contained a total of 13 elementary and 5 secondary schools, and had implemented SBM districtwide over a period of years. Included in its implementation guidelines was

the statement that "all school sites form a group of at least seven people other than the principal, and must, at a minimum, include representatives of parents and certified building staff". In this district, we did indepth studies on four schools by regularly attending site council meetings, and administering our School Site Based Management Survey (Appendix B) to all members of the site councils of each school while the members were at their site council meetings. There were 79% of the membership of the councils present when the questionnaire was administered, and 100% of those present completed the questionnaire. (Table 1 provides a quick picture of sample returns by district, and a summary description of each district)

* * INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE * *

In the second district, which also was one which had implemented site management on a districtwide basis, the same questionnaires were mailed to the superintendent, who in turn sent them out to each school for distribution to the teachers. It is noteworthy that in this district, each school's site council membership was limited to staff currently employed by the school district, resulting in site councils composed almost entirely of teachers. This district contained eight elementary schools and two secondary schools, with a total teaching staff of 295. Of this number, 62 teachers served on individual school site councils, and of this number, 29 completed and returned the

questionnaire (49%). Twelve additional questionnaires were completed and returned from administrators and other teachers not serving on site councils at the time the questionnaire was administered. This entire district had school site management councils in existence for a minimum of five years.

In the third and fourth school districts, individual schools, one being an elementary and one a secondary, had initiated their own site council process, and in both cases, each school was the only school in their respective districts to operate under a site management plan. In both schools, the site councils had included certified and classified staff, as well as representatives from the parents and community. The secondary school's site council also included two students in its membership. Both school's site councils had been operational for more than five years. In these groups, questionnaires were distributed at site council meetings, and 100% of those present completed the questionnaire. Attendance at the meetings at which the questionnaire was distributed was 71% of the total membership.

The district in which the site-managed elementary school was located contained 16 other elementary schools and five secondary schools, the district in which the site-managed secondary school was located contained seven elementary schools and two other secondary schools.

The total number of questionnaires collected was 118. The data from these questionnaires were analyzed as an entire set,

and were divided into a number of subsets representing what we thought might offer some insight into the diversity of responses from the various constituent groups, or insights into the mechanisms that influence certain responses.

Of the total number of questionnaires returned, 68 represent responses coming from individuals associated with elementary schools, and 50 represent responses from individuals representing secondary schools. Ninety-seven represent responses from individuals where site councils had existed for more than two years (most had existed for more than four years), and 21 responses are associated with site councils which had been in existence for less that two years, but more than one full year. Fifty-three responses came from the first district described above which included parents on the councils, and 41 responses came from the second district described above which included only staff members on the site councils. Twenty-four responses came from districts three and four described above, where the individual school was the only school in each respective district that utilized the principles of site based management.

Within the total set of questionnaires collected, 60 respondents identified themselves as teachers, of which 39 were elementary teachers and 21 were secondary teachers, 25 respondents identified themselves as parents, of which 15 were associated with elementary schools, and 10 with secondary schools, 13 identified themselves as community members, and 14 identified themselves as principals or assistant principals. Of

this group of principals, nine were associated with secondary schools, and five with elementary schools. (See Table 1)

We calculated the means for all answers where quantitative figures were used to represent scaled responses. For example, the question "How much do each of the following groups support SBM?", allowed for a response ranging from 1 "not at all", to 7 "exceptionally strong". Individuals were asked to rate their response to this question as it pertained to central office administrators, school board, parents, principal, teachers, education association/union, community and students. Space was also provided for written comments after each category. Participants were likewise asked to give an assessment of the site council with a similar scale rating of 1-7. The questions "To what extent is the site council achieving its goals and objectives?" and "How much do you influence decisions on the site council?" were rated from 1 "not at all" to 7 "all of the time". Finally, the participants were asked to give an overall assessment of SBM, and were asked to respond to the question "Overall, what grade would you give SBM?", on a scale ranging from 1 "very low" to 7 "very high". The means of the various subsets described earlier were noted and significant correlations among the variables were analyzed.

FINDINGS

(Mean scores of the answers given to each item of the survey are shown in Table 2, row 1, with a further breakdown between elementary and secondary schools shown in rowss 2 and 3. Rows 4-7 of Table 2 provide mean scores of responses of teachers, parents, community members, and principals respectively. Table 3 provides a matrix of correlation coefficients obtained by comparing answers on each quantifiable questionnaire item to all the other quantifiable questionnaire items.)

* * INSERT TABLES 2 AND 3 ABOUT HERE * *

First, we found by our measure, that in general, our respondents felt somewhat empowered. On the seven point scale for the question "How much do you influence decisions on the site council?" where 1 was "not at all" and 7 was "all the time", the mean score from all respondents was 4.33 (just above "some of the time" but well under "a lot of the time"). There was almost no difference in the feeling of influence on decision making between parents (4.348) and teachers (4.309), the most numerous groups in the sample. Not surprisingly, community members felt they had the least influence on site council decisions (3.769) while principals felt the most (4.769). In the light of the Malen and Ogawa findings in Salt Lake City, where parents felt that the professionals had all the power, it is interesting to note in our

data the fact that parents only felt slightly less influence than principals and teachers.

Further breakdowns of the data show that there was a small, possibly insignificant, difference in feelings of influence between the district that had only staff members on the site councils (District B, 4.432) and the district that required parents to be a part of the site councils (District A, 4.353). A more significant difference was observed between teacher groups. Those teachers working in elementary schools attributed influence a mean score of (4.471); the mean score of secondary teachers was (4.048). There was almost no difference between the influence perceived by groups that had been involved in SBM longer than two years (4.326) and those with less than two years experience (4.35).

It appears that in certain instances a relationship does exist between a group's assessment of its site based management program and the level of support it feels others give to the SBM concept. The highest level of perceived support was attributed to the school principals (5.862 from all groups, 5.55 from teachers, 6.36 from parents). We also find the highest linear correlations of our study when we correlated the perceived support of principals with the overall grade these same groups gave SBM. For example, the correlation of all groups perception of principal's support and overall assessment was (r.535) and the correlation of the teacher perception of principals support and overall grade was (r.701). Broken down even further, where the

same two factors were correlated from the scores given by elementary and secondary teachers, the correlation from elementary teachers perception of principal support and overall assessment was (r.759), for secondary teachers it was (r.538). This relatively high correlation would seem to indicate that elementary teachers especially rely on their perception of a principal's support of a program to judge if the program is successful.

Correlations based on perceived support and overall assessment from other groups were also interesting, and we note a few. Secondary teachers perception of school board support and overall grade (r.618); elementary teachers perception of school board support and overall grade (r.313); secondary teachers perception of other teachers support and overall grade (r.538); elementary teachers perception of other teachers support and overall grade (r.600); secondary teachers perception of central office support and overall grade (r.457); and elementary teachers perception of central office support and overall grade (r.181).

Most interesting to us was the fact that the amount of influence people felt they had seemed to have very little linear correlation with the score or grade they gave the SBM process. In answering the question "Overall, what grade would you give SBM?" on a 7-point scale from 1 (very low) to 7 (very high), the overall mean of the entire sample rated assessment at (5.027) just slightly above moderately high. When the scores attributed to the question "How much do you influence decisions on the site

council?" were correlated with the scores attributed to overall assessment, the linear correlation was (r.278), indicating the very little if any linear trend exists between these two variables.

Specific subgroups revealed other interesting and surprising correlation findings. For example, the correlation of teacher's influence with overall grade was (r.217). However, when elementary and secondary teachers were separated, the secondary teacher's correlation was (r.463), the elementary teacher's was (r.05). Clearly, secondary teachers feel a stronger need to equate influence with overall assessment of the SBM program, although even at (r.463), it does not indicate an extremely strong relationship. The scores principals gave their influence and overall assessment correlated at (r.516), also one of the higher linear correlations.

Groups of all individuals associated with elementary schools correlated influence and assessment at (r.117) and all individuals associated with secondary schools correlated influence and assessment at (r.555), this latter score being the highest correlation we could find in this category. Finally, in the district where only teachers served on the site council, the correlation between the scores given to influence and overall assessment was (r.434). In the district where parents also served on the councils, the correlation was (r.164). It appears from our study, that a group's overall assessment of its school's site based management program is not highly correlated with its

perceived level of influence on site council decisionmaking.

The most consistent linear correlations from our study appeared when we measured the scores given to the question "To what extent is the site council achieving its goals and objectives?" with the scores given to the question "Overall, what grade would you give SBM?" The correlation of these two variables from all groups in the study was (r.635). Teachers scores provided the highest correlation with (r.729). The lowest correlation was found from the scores of those individuals representing schools that had a SBM program in existence for less than two years (r.363) compared with those from schools with SBM programs longer than two years (r.665).

As a group, parent's scores on achieving goals and objectives were less associated with overall grade (r.344), while principal's scores correlated quite highly (r.658). Finally, as might be expected, where there was a lack of parents on the site council at the one school district, the correlation between achieving goals and objectives and overall grade was slightly higher (r.640) than at the other large district with districtwide implementation but which required parents on the councils (r.605). Our study would seem to indicate, not surprisingly, that the assessment people make of SBM is closely related to how well they feel it is achieving its objectives.

In attempting to determine if the amount of influence individuals felt they had was related to their perception of support for SBM coming from other groups, we could find no

correlation above (r.17). This finding seems to run counter to conventional wisdom on empowerment and participative management, as they are believed to relate to how supportive people feel toward the organizations that allow them to "participate". Only the scores attributed to how well the site council was achieving its goals and objectives correlated slightly with scores given influence (r.377). In other words, whether people felt influential in the site council decision process, had almost no relationship to their perception of how much other groups supported SBM, nor to the grade they gave to SBM and only a very slight correlation (.377) to the extent to which they felt goals and objectives of the council were being met.

DISCUSSION

The findings are in one sense puzzling and in another sense, perhaps not surprising. People don't feel empowered, yet they feel that SBM rates a moderately high performance score (5.027). Parents rate SBM highest, possibly it is because they are the new owners of decision-making influence, not having had as much before. The site council vehicle gives parents a voice that they may not have previously had in such a formal way. Even though they don't feel they have any more influence over decisions than is felt on average by our respondents, this influence is most likely more than they have had and thus they give SBM higher marks than any other group (5.625).

The puzzle is the lack of apparent relationship between

feelings of influence on site council decisions (our measure of empowerment) and the overall assessment people give in evaluating SBM. One would have thought that the more influence people felt that they had, the higher they would rate SBM. Not so. This lack of correlation was especially noticeable among elementary teachers. They feel goals and objectives of the site councils are being met and they give SBM high marks (mean 5.545), but they feel only moderate influence over decisions (mean 4.471). One might explain this by saying that elementary teachers enjoy seeing that goals and objectives are set and met (like doing lesson plans) but don't care about influencing operating decisions. They are happy to let the principal do that.

On the other hand, secondary teachers gave SBM a lower mean score than did elementary teachers (4.095 versus 5.194). Secondary teachers also showed more of a relationship between their perceived influence and the overall grade they gave SBM than elementary teachers (r.463 versus r.050). For secondary teachers, it appears more important to be able to influence decisionmaking than it does for elementary teachers, and since they felt only moderate influence they rated the SBM process somewhat more harshly than did elementary teachers. It is also important, in the eyes of secondary teachers, for the board and central office to be supportive of SBM, while elementary teachers did not seem to care so much about board and central office support, but were very concerned about the principal's support. (This may say something about the different perceptions held by

secondary and elementary teachers of the hierarchical levels of the typical school district organization.)

These findings appear to be consistent with the interview data and other qualitative data gathered from the same sample of people. For example, our recordings of site council meetings in secondary schools seemed to be much more animated, controversial, and intense than those in elementary schools. Secondary teachers, (and sometimes students) want a strong voice and get involved in heated debates over decisions in their site councils.

Our data also support the importance people give to the role of the principal. The score a person gave to the SBM process was highly related to the degree to which that person felt the principal supported the program. Elementary teachers were even more concerned about the support of the principal than were secondary teachers, possibly reflecting the idea that the more discipline-oriented secondary staff feels more "loosely coupled" with the immediate building administrative hierarchy.

The appearance that parents were much less affected in their assessment of SBM by the amount of influence they felt on decisions than were teachers, can have a variety of possible meanings. Parents may be more concerned that the site council achieve its goals than whether or not they have influence on decisions about programs. On the other hand, parents were the most favorably impressed with SBM than any of the sub-groups and seem to feel they have enough influence.

While we don't have a direct measure of people's

satisfaction with their schools, we do have their views on how satisfied they are with the site management process, which we thought might be a useful proxy measure for how good they felt about their schools. In general, as we stated earlier, these scores were fairly high, and consistently so among all groups.

Yet a puzzle remains. SBM is perceived to be successful, seems to be achieving its goals (modest though they may be) but people don't feel especially empowered and most groups (especially parents and elementary teachers) seem not to feel any concern over whether or not they have a great deal of influence over site council decisionmaking. A conclusion one could draw is that SBM in the sixteen schools we studied is a success, even though it does not seem to be affecting the major substance of curriculum and instruction (areas rarely mentioned in interviews). This would lead one to believe that constituents in a school are more concerned with delivery means, with communication, and with areas outside of the academic classroom than they are with the core curriculum and teaching in the school.

Another interpretation might be that SBM is a moderate success, (like PTSAs or parent-advisory groups) because site councils aid in the communication and public relations aspects of the school (especially communication between principal and staff and between parents and the staff and administration.) From looking at our qualitative data, the goals of site councils seem to be a mixture of communication, cooperation and working

together (40%), co-curricular kinds of change (20%), academic program or homework or discipline (30%), or no goals this year (10%). There are indications in our interview data that site councils eventually will want more decisionmaking influence after a time, but our survey data show that in the fourth or fifth year in our schools, this is not yet the case. SBM is alive and involving some people, but in our opinion not yet really visible in terms of any major change in the classroom.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS

ASSESSMENT is the grade assigned by individual stakeholders on a Likert type scale of 1-7, if indicated numerically, and/or written comments in response to the question: "Overall, what grade would you give the SBM program in your school?"

SUPPORT is the perceived level of actively promoting the interests or causes of the school based management program, the levels of which were indicated on a Likert type scale with a range of 1-7.

INFLUENCE is the perceived influence an individual feels he or she has on the site management decision process as indicated on a Likert type scale with a range of 1-7.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES are the desired outcomes of the school based management program as measured by answering the question "to what extent is the site council achieving it's goals and objectives?", and also measured on a Likert type scale from 1-7.

APPENDIX B

University of Minnesota

Strategic Management Research Center

School Site-Based Management Survey

Section I. Background Information:

Name of School _____

(Check each applicable item)

___ Teaching Staff
___ Non-Teaching Staff
___ Student
___ Parent of child in this school
___ Community Member
___ Building Principal
___ Other Building Administrator
___ District Administrator
___ Site Council (SC) Member
___ Current SC Chairperson
___ Previous SC member
___ SC Coordinator
___ School Board Member
___ Other _____

Average number of hours per month you spend on School Site-Based Management (SBM) activities _____

Section II. Assessment of School Site-Based Management (SBM)
(Please circle number and/or answer question)

A. Indicate support of SBM with a score (1-7). How much do each of the following groups support SBM? Please comment on your answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Central Office Administrators (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

School Board (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Parents (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Principal (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Teachers (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Education Association/Union (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Community (comments) _____

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	weak	moderately weak	moderate	moderately strong	strong	exceptionally strong

Students (comments) _____

_____

_____

B. List below the most important changes brought about by SBM in your school(s).

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. What are the goals of the SBM program in your school(s)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section III. Assessment of Site Control

A. To what extent is the site council achieving its goals and objectives?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	almost never	very few times	some of the time	a lot of the time	most of the time	all of the time

comments _____

_____

_____

B. How much do you influence decisions on the site council?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all	almost never	very few times	some of the time	a lot of the time	most of the time	all of the time

comments _____

_____

_____

Section IV. Overall Assessment

A. Overall, what grade would you give SMB? (circle score)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very low	low	moderately low	moderate	moderately high	high	very high

B. What <u>criteria</u> do you use to assess the effectiveness of SEM, i.e. what does it have to do well for you to give it a 'high' or 'very high' grade?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. What do you forsee to be the issues with SEM over the next year?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

TABLE 1

SAMPLE RETURNS BY DISTRICT

DISTRICT	TOTAL SCHOOLS	SAMPLE SCHOOLS	TOTAL SC MEMBERS	QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED	PERCENT
A	ELEM-13,SECD-5	ELEM-2,SECD-2	67	53	79
B	ELEM-8,SECD-2	ELEM-8,SECD-2	62	29	49
			DIST B FORMER SC MEMBERS	12	
C	ELEM-17,SECD-5	ELEM-1	10	9	90
D	ELEM-7,SECD-3	SECD-1	24	15	63

TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED N=118

ADDITIONAL SUBGROUP CLASSIFICATIONS

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS - 39

SECONDARY TEACHERS - 21

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PARENTS - 15

SECONDARY SCHOOL PARENTS - 10

COMMUNITY MEMBERS - 13

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS - 9

SECONDARY PRINCIPALS OR AP - 5

UNCLASSIFIED - 6

TABLE 2

MEAN SCORES RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON SURVEY

Perceived Support of...Indicated on a Scale of 1 - 7

	SAMPLE SIZE	CO	SB	PA	PR	TE	EA	CM	ST	GAO	INF	OAA
ALL	118	4.917	4.651	4.352	5.862	5.078	3.966	3.874	3.412	5.036	4.33	5.027
ELEM	68	5.127	4.818	4.328	5.941	5.206	3.769	3.695	3.153	5.419	4.383	5.328
SECD	50	4.622	4.395	4.386	5.75	4.896	4.243	4.114	3.767	4.551	4.265	4.633
TE	60	5.136	4.621	3.963	5.55	4.85	4	3.558	2.885	4.944	4.309	4.789
PA	25	4.905	5.143	5	6.36	5.84	3.889	4.217	4.708	5.125	4.348	5.625
CM	13	4.2	4.182	4.4	5.909	4.667	3.778	4.364	3.444	5	3.769	4.846
PR	14	4.308	4.385	5	6.143	5.154	4.167	4.273	3.455	5.286	4.769	5.231

CO - CENTRAL OFFICE
SB - SCHOOL BOARD
PA - PARENTS
GAO - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
PR - PRINCIPALS
TE - TEACHERS
EA - ED ASSOC/UNION
INF - INFLUENCE
CM - COMMUNITY MEMBERS
ST - STUDENTS
OAA - OVERALL ASSESSMENT
ALL - ENTIRE SAMPLE
ELEM - ELEMENTARY PEOPLE
SECD - SECONDARY PEOPLE

TABLE 3

CORRELATION MATRIX OF ALL SCORES N = 118

	CO	SB	PA	PR	TE	EA	CM	ST	GAO	INF
SB	0.736									
PA	0.173	0.311								
PR	0.006	0.111	0.277							
TE	0.254	0.339	0.619	0.363						
EA	0.174	0.339	0.457	0.065	0.424					
CM	0.293	0.339	0.738	0.175	0.62	0.445				
ST	-0.071	0.098	0.524	0.34	0.539	0.26	0.531			
GAO	0.188	0.314	0.317	0.414	0.312	0.228	0.261	0.124		
INF	0.169	0.17	0.028	0.161	0.085	0.115	-0.017	-0.021	0.377	
OAA	0.309	0.466	0.486	0.535	0.584	0.247	0.447	0.436	0.635	0.278

CO - CENTRAL OFFICE
SB - SCHOOL BOARD
PA - PARENTS
GAO - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
PR - PRINCIPALS
TE - TEACHERS
EA - ED ASSOC/UNION
INF - INFLUENCE
CM - COMMUNITY MEMBERS
ST - STUDENTS
OAA - OVERALL ASSESSMENT
ALL - ENTIRE SAMPLE

REFERENCES

Belasco, J.A. and Alutto, J.A. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction", Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol.8, No.1, Winter 1972.

Casner-Lotto, Jill. "Expanding the Teacher's Role: Hammond's School Improvement Process", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol.69, No.5, January, 1988.

Chapman, J., and Boyd, W.L. "Decentralization, Devolution, and the School Principal: Australian Lesson on Statewide Educational Reform:, Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol.22, No.4, 1986, p.28-58.

Chavkin, N.G. and Williams, D.L. "Enhancing Parent Involvement - Guidelines for Access to an Important Resource for School Administrators", Education and Urban Society, Vol.19, No.2 Feb. 1987, 164-184

Clune, W. H., and White, P.A. School Based Management: Institutional Variation, Implementation, and Issues for Further Research. Center for Policy Research in Education. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Eagleton Institute of Politics.)

Conway, James A. "The Myth, Mystery, and Mastery of Participative Decision Making in Education:, Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol.20, No.3, Summer 1984, 11-40.

Cooper, Bruce S. "New Context, New Paradigm: Implications of School Site Management for School Administration", New York: Fordham University School of Education, 1988.

Harrison, C.R. "Site-based Management: The Realities of Implementation." Educational Leadership, Vol.46, May, 1989, 55-58.

Jenni, Roger. School-based Management: Implementing an Innovation in Education, (Discussion Paper No. 104). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Strategic Management Research Center, November, 1988. (MESPA Principal vol. 31, no.1.)

Jenni, Roger. A Practitioner's Guide to School Based Management. Minnesota Elementary School Principal's Association, St. Paul, MN, 1990.

Lindquist, Karin, and Mauriel, John. "School-Based Management Doomed to Failure?", Education and Urban Society, Vol.21, No.4, 1989, 403-416.

Locke, E.A. and Schweiger, D.M. "Participation in Decision Making: One More Look", Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol.1, 1979, 265-339.

Malen, B. and Ogawa, R.T. "Professional-patron Influence on Site-based Governance Councils: A confounding case study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Vol.10, No.4, 1988, 251-270

Malen, B., Ogawa, R., Kranz, J. "An analysis of Site Based Management as an Education Reform Strategy", FOCUS, University of Utah, 1989.

Mauriel, John. "School Based Management and Decisionmaking--Myths and Realities", Minnesota Innovation Research Program, Minneapolis, 1988.

Mauriel, J., and Jenni, R. "School Based Management Fallacies and Facts", Strategic Management Research Center, University of Minnesota, Mineapolis 1989.

Miller, Jon. "Decision Making and Organizational Effectiveness", Sociology of Work and Occupations, Vol.7, No.1, Feb 80, Sage Publications, 55-79.

Riley, Dan. "Teacher Utilization of Avenues for Participatory Decision Making", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol.22, No.1, Winter 1984.